



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/725,978	11/29/2000	Takatoshi Tomooka	JP9-1999-0250US1(8728-455	8979

7590 12/14/2004

Frank Chau, Esq.
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLP
Suite 501
1900 Hempstead Turnpike
East Meadow, NY 11554

EXAMINER

ABDULSELAM, ABBAS I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2674

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/725,978

Applicant(s)

TOMOOKA ET AL.

Examiner

Abbas I Abdulsalam

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,7,11,14,18,20 and 25-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6,8-10,12,13,15-17,19 and 21-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see # 14, filed 10/08/04, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-29 under U.S.C. (103) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Mamiya et al. (USPN 6778168).

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 7, 11, 14, 18 and 20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 10-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6778168. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

Claim 1 of the present application is met by claims 10-12 of the patent. It would have been obvious that "a panel ID recognition section", "a window ID allocation section" and "an

Art Unit: 2674

image signal transfer section” as used in the present application are patently indistinctive from and correspond to “recognition application program”, “order information setting device”, and “image signal transferring device” as used in the patent.

Claim 7 of the present application is met by claims 10-12 of the patent. It would have been obvious that “a panel ID recognition section”, “a window ID allocation section” and “an image signal transfer section” as used in the present application are patently indistinctive from and correspond to “recognition application program”, “order information setting device”, and “image signal transferring device” as used in the patent.

Claim 11 of the present application is met by claims 10-12 of the patent. It would have been obvious that “a panel ID setting means”, “recognition means” as used in the present application are patently indistinctive from and correspond to “recognition application program”. It would have been obvious that “receiving means” as used in the present application is patently indistinctive from and corresponds to “receiving device” as used in the patent.

Claim 14 of the present application is met by claims 10-12 of the patent. It would have been obvious that “a panel ID setting means”, “recognition means” as used in the present application are patently indistinctive from and correspond to “recognition application program”. It would have been obvious that “receiving means” as used in the present application is patently indistinctive from and corresponds to “receiving device”.

Claim 18 of the present application is met by claims 10-12 of the patent. It would have been obvious that “a panel ID as identifier”, “allocating a window” and “and outputting an image” as used in the present application are patently indistinctive from and correspond to

Art Unit: 2674

“recognition application program”, “order information setting device”, and “image signal transferring device” as used in the patent.

Claim 20 of the present application is met by claims 10-12 of the patent. It would have been obvious that “setting the panel ID”, “allocating window ID” and “transferring the image information” as used in the present application are patently indistinctive from and correspond to “recognition application program”, “order information setting device”, and “image signal transferring device” as used in the patent.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-17, 19 and 21-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuhashi et al. (USPN 6583771).

Regarding claim 25, Furuhashi teaches a multi-display system including a plurality of liquid crystal panels, and a plurality of display units such that each display unit has its own ID

Art Unit: 2674

number assigned to it, and includes writing and reading means with respect to a frame memory, Furuhashi also teaches a control signal that transfers commands to the microcomputer (col. 5, col. 6, lines 56-59, col. 21, lines 24-33 and col. 21, 48-50; also see Fig 1 (A110, A111, 101-2...101-n). Furuhashi teaches an ID setting circuit (129) for setting an ID number for the liquid crystal panels as shown in Fig. 1. Furthermore, Furuhashi teaches a single controller (1501) controlling image-displaying operations for displaying images in various formats on the plurality of liquid crystal panels (1501 to 1529). See col. 16, lines 19-22 and Fig. 15.

Furuhashi does not specifically “setting said panel ID to "0" for all of the display panels at the time of turning on a power source”, “setting said panel ID to a value other than "0" using a command for said display panel from which the attribute information is read out”, “by a display panel having a panel ID of "0", inhibiting said command from the host system from being sent to a downstream display panel”; and “by a display panel having the panel ID other than "0", selecting one of the plurality of display panels connected to the downstream side. However, as mentioned above, Furuhashi teaches an ID setting circuit (129) for setting an ID number for the liquid crystal panels as shown in Fig. 1 along with a single controller (1501) controlling image displaying operations for displaying images in various formats on the plurality of liquid crystal panels as shown in Fig. 15. In addition, Furuhashi teaches a microcomputer (128) that compares the ID number assigned to the command with a set ID number set in the ID setting circuit (129) and executes the command when those ID numbers coincide with each other (col. 7, lines 14-17 and Fig. 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Furuhashi's ID setting circuit (129) along with a microcomputer (128) as shown in Fig. 1 and a single controller (1501) as shown in Fig. 15 for the purpose of establishing a relationship between ID number of the panels and the command signals with respect to the panels. One would have been motivated in view of the suggestion that the ID setting circuit (129) along with a microcomputer (128) as configured in Fig. 1 and a single controller (1501) as configured in Fig. 15 equivalently yield the desired "setting of the panel ID" with the desired status of the display panel/panels. It would have been obvious the microcomputer (128) as configured in Fig. 1 along with the signal controlling could provide the desired commands with respect to attribute as well as transfer information, signals being sent and inhibiting a command.

Regarding claims 26-29, Furuhashi teaches the ID setting circuit (129) along with a microcomputer (128) (Fig. 1) and a single controller (1501) (Fig. 15).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to **Abbas Abdulsalam** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-8591**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard Hjerpe**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4709**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of patents and Trademarks

Art Unit: 2674

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology center 2600 customer Service office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Abbas Abdulsalam

Examiner

Art Unit 2674

December 9, 2004


XIAO WU
PRIMARY EXAMINER